

To: CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Carolyn Yale/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Carolyn Yale/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Carolyn Yale/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Carolyn Yale/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Laura Fujii/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: []
From: CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Thur 7/29/2010 11:23:06 PM
Subject: summary -- interesting BDCP steering committee meeting

Hi All,

I had decided I wouldn't be attending many more of the steering committee meetings, but I hoped they would discuss the flow criteria so I went. Here are a few highlights. Tom Howard and Les Grober attended and provided a power point presentation about the state's draft flow criteria. There were passionate responses to the draft report and how it may be used.

When asked (I think by Westlands), "What would happen if BDCP adopted the draft flow criteria as the operations preferred alternative?" Scarborough and Ebbet answered, "they probably would not meet our project purpose."

Steering committee plans to discuss what they will do with the SWRCB Flow Criteria report during the August 12 meeting.

Timeline for implementing Conservation Measures shows that not many conservation projects and habitat mitigation will be implemented close to proposed impacts. For example, the most well developed project thus far, the Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Habitat improvements are proposed to restore 14K acres by year 10, 25K acres by year 25, and 65K acres by year 40.

Cost Estimates -- many large cost estimate areas not complete (methylmercury monitoring, changed circumstances, adaptive management and research); CCWD concerned that facilities costs have been underestimated; DOI concurred but with different concerns, inflation rate and other indexes too low; TNC & DoF concerned that mitigation costs for west side Restoration Opportunity Area are artificially elevated and causing restoration costs to appear much too expensive. West side ROA costs included estimates of filling very subsided delta islands with fill material, which causes cost estimates to go up high quickly. There appears to be some sensitivity about discussing cost allocation -- which parties of the PRE's are bearing which costs. There were request by SC members to bring forward cost allocation and financing information ASAP.

I could only stay until noon. Two presentations were given: one dealing with location of intakes and how that impacts ability to export water and the second addressing the water quality impact of two levee failure scenarios with and without climate change impacts. These presentations will be available tomorrow. They are interesting. One of the most interesting conclusions DWR makes is that salinity does not change much near the proposed new intake locations under any levee break/climate change scenario. Later today or tomorrow, the group will be given a presentation and have a follow up discussion on the aquatic environment effects analysis. That was supposed to happen this morning but they postponed it until this afternoon, after I was gone.

Erin Foresman
US EPA Region 9

1325 J Street, 14th floor
C/O Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922
Phone: (916) 557 5253
Fax: (916) 557 6877